

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**In re Application of:**

Norman Booth

**Serial No.:** 10/587,534

**Filed:** September 12, 2007

**For:** CATHETER ASSEMBLY WITH AN  
ADJUSTABLE LOOP

**Confirmation No.:** 9688

**Examiner:** L. Wilson

**Group Art Unit:** 3767

**Attorney Docket No.:** 3485-P10380US  
(CRx 6/SIP  
69105USP00)

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

October 4, 2011

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Mail Stop ISSUE FEE  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication is filed in response to the Notice of Allowance dated July 5, 2011 and sets forth Applicants' comments, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e), on the Examiner's Statement of Allowable Subject Matter accompanying the Notice of Allowance.

In the Notice of Allowance, the Examiner indicates:

Applicant's argument filed 10 June 2011 are persuasive, the rejection of claims 1-16 under 37 USC 103(a) over Thompson in view of Stewart is withdrawn. Applicant argued that combining Thompson with shape-memory transverse [sic] loop of Stewart, would require anchoring the loop of Stewart which would warp the pre-formed shape-memory loop of Stewart, which would render Stewart unsuitable for its intended purpose.




Applicant concurs with the reasons as stated by the Examiner insofar as they comprise a summary, which is exemplary and not limiting. However, the scope of the claims is based on the actual language of the claims and equivalents thereof, and not on a paraphrase or summary of the claim language.

The independent claims as allowed recite features in addition to, and in different language than, those described in the Statement of Allowable Subject Matter. Furthermore, the dependent claims recite elements in addition to those of the independent claims, which are also not reflected in the Statement of Allowable Subject Matter. Such additional elements, in combination with those of the independent claims from which each claim depends, provide additional reasons for patentability. Accordingly, the scope of the claims must be determined from the literal language of each as a whole, as well as all equivalents thereof.

Therefore, to the extent that the Examiner's reasons for allowance as stated are not relevant to, or wholly encompassing of, a particular claim, independent or dependent, Applicants assume that (pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e)) the Examiner has determined that the record of the prosecution as a whole of the application makes clear the reasons for allowing those claims. Further, it appears, pursuant to M.P.E.P. 1302.14, that the Examiner's Statements of Allowable Subject Matter are not intended to encompass all of the reasons for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven W. Gutke  
Registration No. 64,247  
Attorney for Applicant  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: October 4, 2011  
SWG/vmm:nrm